

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/598,458

Applicant(s)
Hamor et al

Examiner
James W. Myhre

Art Unit
3622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) Walter G. Hanchuk

(2) Mark Pratt

(4) Alan Hamor

Date of Interview Sep 9, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16

Identification of prior art discussed:

Angles et al (5,933,811), Gerszberg et al (6,044,403), Logan et al (5,721,827)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant discussed how the claimed revenue pool and functional host differed from the Angles reference. In particular, Angles did not disclose that the revenue pool is financed by the advertisers, etc. before presenting the content and advertisements to clients. Thus, the amount paid into the revenue pool by the advertisers is not based on the number of impressions, i.e. it is a predetermined, set amount, which was then divided up among the content providers according to their percentage of total impressions. The functional host was described as a small piece of software, such as a Java script, that was embedded in the page, not embedded in the client computer as a separate browser-like program. The Examiner recommended that these features be more clearly defined in the claims and that a further review of Angles and the other references would be needed. The Applicant indicated that an RCE would probably be submitted to make these changes.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**JAMES W. MYHRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3622**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required